



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,426	07/21/2003	Tsung-Huei Ren	ALIP0006USA	1425
27765	7590	05/08/2006	EXAMINER	
NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION P.O. BOX 506 MERRIFIELD, VA 22116			LAMB, CHRISTOPHER RAY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2627	

DATE MAILED: 05/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/604,426	REN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher R. Lamb	2627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-8 and 11-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-7, and 13-16 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8, 11 and 12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line two, "comprising following steps" should be "comprising the following steps." Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 8 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakajima et al. (US 2001/006500 A1).

Regarding claim 8:

Nakajima discloses a method for burning an optical disc in an optical recording system comprising the following steps:

- (a) writing data onto the optical disc according to a write strategy and reading an RF signal from the optical disc (paragraphs 64-65);
- (b) processing the RF signal (paragraph 66);
- (c) generating delay signals according to the processed RF signal by:
delaying the processed RF signal (Fig. 10: DF₁₁-DF₁₅);
outputting a control signal according to a standard clock and the processed RF signal (paragraph 114: the control signal is the enable signal from the counter);

generating a delay signal according to the control signal and the delayed RF signals (paragraph 114: the delay signal is the accumulation value J_r); and

(d) configuring the write strategy according to the delay signals (paragraph 73);

wherein the delay signal is formed by a plurality of delay bits received from a plurality of buffers, each buffer connected to a delay cell (Fig. 10: DF_{16} is a plurality of buffers, because it stores accumulated information, as described in paragraph 113. Although it is depicted in Fig. 10 as one item, it is in fact a plurality of cells as detailed in Fig. 4. DF_{17} is a delay cell, because it delays outputting the accumulated signal until it receives the enable signal from the counter, as in paragraph 114, and the two are clearly connected in Fig. 10).

Regarding claim 11:

In the method of Nakajima the RF signal is read from a lead-in area of the optical disk (paragraph 5: the test recording is done in a predetermined area. In the standard, that area is the lead-in area).

Regarding claim 12:

In the method of Nakajima the write strategy in step (d) is configured according to the material and manufacturer of the optical disc (paragraph 37: it is fine tuned for each optical disc, so it inherently must adjust for variations in material and manufacturer).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 1, 4-7, 13, 14, 15, and 16 are allowed.
5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claim 1:

The closest prior art of record, Nakajima, contains most elements of the claim as noted in the previous action. In particular, Nakajima teaches a buffer set connected to a delay chain. However, Nakajima fails to teach or suggest **the buffer set having a plurality of buffers each connected to a delay cell for receiving a delay bit of the delay signal transmitted from the delay cell**. These elements in combination with the other elements of the claim render it allowable over the prior art of record.

Regarding claims 4-7, they are dependent on claim 1.

Regarding claims 13-14, they contain language similar to claim 1.

Regarding claim 15:

As it is similar to claim 8, the closest prior art of record, Nakajima, contains most elements of the claim as noted in the rejection of claim 8 above.

Additionally, Nakajima discloses delaying the processed RF signal with a delay chain having a plurality of delay cells connected in a cascade manner (Fig. 10).

However, Nakajima fails to teach or suggest wherein **an output of each delay cell is coupled to a clock input of a following delay cell**. These elements in combination with the other elements of the claim render it allowable over the prior art of record.

Regarding claim 16, it is dependent on claim 15.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments regarding claims 8 and 11-12, filed April 19th, 2006, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 8:

Applicant has argued (page 10), that the addition of the method limitation corresponding to original claim 3 renders the claim allowable.

It is true that the language of the original claim 3 has been added to claim 8, and that claim 3 was not rejected. However, claim 3 included additional elements and interstructural relationships not claimed in the amended claim 8. Because these elements are lacking, claim 8 has still been rejected over Nakajima, as noted above.

In particular, Applicant asserts (page 10) that the delay cells (DFF₁₁-DFF₁₅) of Nakajima are separated from the buffers (DFF₁₆, DFF₁₇). However, as noted above, the examiner has interpreted DFF₁₆ as the buffers and DFF₁₇ as another set of delay cells; claim 8 only requires that each buffer be connected to "a delay cell," and DFF₁₇ and DFF₁₆ are clearly connected.

This is opposed to the original claim 3, which required that the buffers be each connected to a delay cell **for receiving a delay bit of the delay signal transmitted from the delay cell**; in Nakajima, DFF₁₇ and DFF₁₆ are in the other order, so that the delay cells are connected for receiving the delay signals transmitted from the buffers.

Regarding claims 11 and 12, Applicant has only argued that they are allowable because they are dependent on claim 8. As the Examiner has rejected claim 8, this argument is not persuasive.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2627

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher R. Lamb whose telephone number is (572) 272-5264. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Korzuch can be reached on (571) 272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

5/2/06



THANG V. TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER